


*By
concluded*

and



wherein i and j are independently 0, 1, 2,
R₁₃, R₁₄, R₁₅, R₁₆ are each independently hydrogen, lower
alkyl, alkaryl of from 7 to 10 carbon atoms; and

NR₁₃R₁₄ is also mono or bicyclic ring with one to
four hetero atoms as N,O,S.

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.
Applicant appreciates the indication that Claims 10, 20,
23-25 and 27-29 would be allowable if written in
independent form. Those claims that are dependent upon
Claim 1 should be considered allowable in light of the
modifications to Claim 1.

Claims 2-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 21 are rejected
under 35 U.S.C. §112 for various reasons as outlined in the
Office Action. The claims have now been revised and it is
respectfully submitted that they are now consistent with 35
U.S.C. §112.

Claims 1-3, 12-16, 18, 22, 26 and 30-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Omar et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Omar is particularly interested in antimicrobial materials that are thio semi-carbazides. Compound number 12 of Omar has an n butyl group in the 2 position on the quinazoline ring. That position is comparable to Applicant's R₂. As can be seen from the revision to claim 1, when a thio semi-carbazide is present in the formula, the alkyl group has been deleted as one of the possibilities for R₂. The other phenyl derivatives have previously been deleted from the scope of the compound claims. Accordingly, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Omar is not particularly relevant to the claims as present.

Claims 1-3, 12-16, 18, 22, 26 and 30-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Omar et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. As can be seen from the revisions to the claims, the claims are of a different scope than had previously present in the file. In addition, none of the usages in the present case (see Claims 41-49) are described by Omar. Accordingly, therefore, Applicant has cancelled Claims 30-40 and have substituted independent claims for each of the methods recited. Omar does not teach such methods nor suggest such methods.

Applicant has been required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to select a single disclosed species. Applicant traverses this requirement. However, for purposes of facilitating prosecution, Applicant elects Example 7 in Table 1. The references are attached. The references are identified by the check mark on the previously submitted Information Disclosure Statements.

In view of the above comments, it would appear the case is in condition for allowance and a notification of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WARNER LAMBERT COMPANY

Elizabeth M. Anderson

Elizabeth M. Anderson
Registration No. 31,585
2800 Plymouth Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48105
(313) 996-7304

Date: 7-30-96

EA3z9432.wp5